



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/060,710	01/30/2002	Joseph Vistitsky	30193/10000	8200

4743 7590 03/12/2004

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
6300 SEARS TOWER
233 S. WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

MORRISON, NASCHICA SANDERS

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3632

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/060,710

Applicant(s)

VISTITSKY ET AL.

Examiner

Naschica S Morrison

Art Unit

3632

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Naschica S Morrison.

(3) _____.

(2) Saeid Mirsafian.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 March 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,36,42,44 and 53.

Identification of prior art discussed: Fried '439, Kobayashi et al., Schaeffer '971, Klemis '124.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Regarding claim 1, Applicant argued that Fried does not teach at least two steps. Examiner explained how the reference meets this limitation. Applicant suggested amendments to the claim but examiner did not agree that such amendments would overcome the rejection. Regarding claim 36, Applicant argued that Klemis does not expressly teach the method steps recited; however examiner did not agree since Fig. 3 shows the person inherently leaning on the support device. Regarding claim 42, Applicant argued that Klemis is not combinable with Fried and thus does not teach the method step of fastening the body support device. Examiner disagreed and pointed out that the claim does not specify where the device is fastened on the user's body and stated that the rejection of the claim may or may not be removed if the claim was amended to specify attachment to the waist region. Regarding claims 44 and 53, the Applicant restated previous arguments regarding the method steps believed to be novel (with regard to Fried) and further argued that Kobayashi does not teach including weights to hold the device against the elevated surface. Examiner pointed out that the method claim does not recite the stated function in combination with the step of placing a weight on the device, thus the rejection of the method step is proper .